

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/646,405	08/22/2003	Wei Wang	AMAT/3177.D1/CPI/L/B/PJS 9508		
44257	7590 04/21/2006		EXAMINER		
	ON & SHERIDAN, LLP OAK BOULEVARD, SUIT	MCDONALD, RODNEY GLENN			
HOUSTON,	•	E 1300	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1753		
			DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/646,405	WANG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Rodney G. McDonald	1753		

	Rodney G. McDonald	1753	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP		· ·	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply more	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) \square The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date	**	36/a) and the appropria	to extension for
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	diance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be	filed within two month	as of the data of
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	hut prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ocauco
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO		scause
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-12 and 14-32.		l be entered and an ε	explanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	4 h = 6 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 4 h = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 = 0 =		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. So	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	Is to provide a 1).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 		·	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	o(s)	
13.		Node JACA Rodney G. McDona Primary Examinar	ald .
		Driman, Evaminar	

Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1753

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Introducing the second gas into the chamber " to deposit the metallic film layers" was not considered in the finally rejected claims .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued that the primary reference does not teach depositing metallic layes on the substrate by utilizing a second gas introduced to the substrate. The Examiner argues that the primary reference Tadahshi et al. teach that the second gas is introduced to react with the metal film to produce a metal oxide or metal nitride. As Applicant shows in their specification at Page 23 paragraph 0023 a metallic layer of TiN is deposited on the substrate. The primary reference Tadashi et al. teach depositing aluminum oxide (Al2O3) or aluminum nitride (AlN) on the substrate. Clearly a layer of AlN is a metallic layer containing aluminum and nitrogen similar to Applicant's TiN layer which contains titanium and nitrogen. It is noted that layers of TiN are insulating (i.e have various resistivities) when deposited in both the conventional process and Applicant's process as highlighted by Applicant in their Table 1. Therefore Tadashi et al. teach a metallic layer of AlN even though Applicant refers to this as a ultrathin resistive layer. Applicant's amendment was not entered because the final step of the claims utilizing the second gas was not considered with the limitation of depositing metallic film layers. As highlighted above there is a question as to what is to be considered a metallic layer i.e. a layer containing metal or a layer contining a metal and another element such as nitrogen.